

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6- 10, 13 - 17, and 19 - 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over KURLANDER. The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 10, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over KURLANDER in view of ASTLE. The examiner has rejected claims 4, 11, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over KURLANDER in view of KLIENMAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to include the subject matter of claims 2, 9, and 16, respectively. Accordingly, claims 2, 9, and 16 have been canceled.

Each of the independent claims now recites an electronic comic displayed frame by frame on the screen by zooming-in each frame sequentially. See Figs. 5 - 12 and pages 13 - 15 for an example of zoom processing. The cited portion of KURLANDER does not refer to any type of zooming, much less the claimed zooming of each frame sequentially. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 15.

Although ASTLE generally refers to fade in/out processing, the reference does not disclose fading a specific frame, as recited in claims 3, 10, and 17. The subject matter of claims 4, 11, and 18 is also not shown or suggested by the applied references. The cited portion of the reference does not refer to storing text data for two languages. Rather, it

states that text strings can be translated to another language without re-specifying their position. Storing, rather than translating, reduces processing.

Part by part display of words within a balloon is not shown by KURLANDER. The reference discloses user entered data in a dialog box. It appears that the entire passage is displayed within the balloon portion at one time, after the user finishes entering text data. See col. 7, lines 1 - 33. Thus, the features of claims 5, 12, and 20 do not appear to be taught or suggested by the applied references. Finally, claims 6, 13, and 20 recite fading words. The applied references do not disclose or suggest such a feature.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the pending claims.

New claims 22 - 24 do not add any prohibited new matter. They are supported, *inter alia*, by page 14 of the specification.

Dependent claims 3 - 7, 10 - 14, and 17 - 24 all depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 15 and are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that an indication of the allowability of all the claims currently pending in the present application is provided.

Any amendments to the claims in this amendment that have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art should be considered to have been

P21975.A06

made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hiroshi MINAGAWA et al.

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

February 12, 2004  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191